view of *Duso et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,750). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Patent Office maintains the position that in disclosing that images are alternately selected from display buffer A and display buffer B for display to customers, *Bishop* remedies the deficiencies of *Oki* with respect to Applicants' claimed schedule management section generating the image control signal on the basis of schedule data in which a display order and a display time of the plural video information are specified. Applicants disagree.

As provided in Applicants' previous response, *Bishop* discloses a system that displays video images using a fractional double buffering technique. As a result, a graphics CPU renders (writes) an object to be displayed in a display buffer that is not currently being displayed, while an object stored in another buffer is provided to a display. *See* Bishop, col. 5, lines 6-21. During operation, one display buffer is updated with new object data while the other display buffer is read by the display circuitry and its object displayed on the display. Particularly, a multiplexer alternately selects the display buffers, and presents the data to the display based on a control signal issued by the CPU. Id., col. 5, lines 22-29.

The alternate selection of the display buffers is not analogous to Applicants' claimed schedule management section. Namely, Applicants' claimed schedule management section specifies a display order and display time of the plural video information through schedule data. Stated differently the schedule data is associated with the plural video information to be displayed. *See* Applicants' disclosure, Fig. 5. In contrast, *Bishop* discloses a system in which a multiplexer alternately selects the display buffers, and presents the data to the display based on

a control signal issued by the CPU. In other words, the multiplexer selects the display buffer is selected without regard to the image to be displayed. As a result, one of ordinary skill would understand that *Bishop* cannot reasonably be interpreted as having a schedule management section as recited in Applicants' claims. In fact, as argued previously *Bishop* places no specified constraint or associates a display order or display time with each respective image. Rather, there is a constraint on the selection of the display buffer.

As shown in Figure 5, Applicants describe with particularity the meaning of the term schedule data as it relates to each respective image. Applicants are fully aware that during examination claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. This "interpretation", however, must be consistent with Applicants' Specification. *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1403 75 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2005). In *Phillips*, the Court found that when employing the "broadest reasonable interpretation" standard, **the PTO determines the scope of claims in patent applications not solely on the basis of the claim language, but upon giving claims their broadest reasonable construction "in light of the specification as it would be interpreted of one of ordinary skill in the art**." *In Re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1364 [70 USPQ2d 1827] (Fed. Cir. 2004). Indeed, the rules of the PTO require that application claims must "conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support for anteceding basis in a description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description." 37 CFR 1.75 (d)(1), 415 F.3d at 1316, 75 USPQ2d at 1329.

Applicants submit that the PTO has not followed the broadest reasonable interpretation standard set forth by the Federal Circuit with respect to the claimed term "schedule data". Any reasonable interpretation of the claims cannot reasonably be interpreted as being analogous to the operation of a multiplexer which does not include specified display order and display time for each image. Rather, the multiplexer merely alternately selects one of two buffers without regard to a particular image that is to be displayed.

As such, the combination of *Oki* and *Bishop* does not render claim 1 obvious.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1, and additionally recites the following a display time of each segment of the video information is a time longer than a time for the segment to be stored to one of the storage areas by returning the segment to a state before the processed digital static image video information is processed in the video information receiving and display device. This feature is related to schedule data management in which the scheduled time to switch buffers is longer than the time required for extracting and storing the static image. *See* Applicants' disclosure, pgph [0030]. As discussed above, the combination of *Oki* and *Bishop* fails to disclose or suggest every feature recited in the claims and in particular schedule management section generating the image control signal on the basis of schedule data in which a display order and a display time of the plural video information are specified, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is deemed appropriate.

In summary, *Oki* and *Bishop* when applied individually or collectively fail to disclose or suggest every feature and/or the combination of features recited in Applicants' claims. Moreover, secondary references *Potrebic* and *Duso* do not disclose any features that one of ordinary skill would reasonably believes resolves

the aforementioned deficiencies with respect to independent claim 1. For at least

these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and

withdrawal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is proper.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully

submit that claims 1-6 and 8-11 are allowable and this application is in condition for

allowance. In the event any issues adverse to allowance remain, the PTO is

encouraged to contact Applicants' representative identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: <u>April 6, 2010</u>   By: <u>/Shawn B. Cage/</u>
                                               Shawn B. Cage
                                               Registration No. 51522

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620